Bill R

UFL NEWS

A Newsletter of the University Federation of Librarians, Berkeley Campus, AFT Local 1795
Representing librarians at the University of California, Berkeley

June 1990 | Editor: Lillian Castillo-Speed | Volume 4 No. 1

A TIME OF GOOD CHANGE

Mergers, legal decisions, grievance decisions, and other developments are covered in this issue of your Union newsletter. These changes are, on the whole, favorable for the Union and its members. The merger of the two Berkeley locals (See article "Proposal for Local Merger) promises to make the Union stronger on the campus by creating a much larger membership. We can rejoice that the Supreme Court has set another precedent in its recent decision about open personnel files in cases of suspected discrimination in tenure cases. And we can also be happy for Dan Tsang, who successfully fought his way through to getting his rights.

All this leads us to remind you to think about joining the Union. An application form is included in this newsletter for your consideration. This form can be returned to any member of the Executive Committee. For those librarians new to the campus, we apologize for not contacting you on arrival. It can take awhile to learn of your appointment and this is only complicated by the fact that we don't have use of the campus mail or telephones to contact you. We promise to improve in this area.

This coming year should be an exciting and challenging one. We ask you to join us in our work and to help us identify issues of concern. Any questions? Call us. Any areas we should look into? Drop us a note. WE'RE ON YOUR SIDE. JOIN US!

LIBRARIAN REVIEW PROCESS REVIEWED

Enclosed with this newsletter is our attempt to give an overview of what is being done at Berkeley during our reviews. Besides providing a guide to new librarians on campus and information on their rights, we hope to begin a discussion of the entire process. Please look at it and compare it to your perception of the process. If it differs, please let us know. "Librarian Review Process, Parts 1 and 2" was written by Bill Whitson, who has been a librarian at Berkeley since 1970, has served two terms as Chair of LAUC-B (1974-75), and has served on CAPA.

KATZ AT RUTGERS

We wish the best to Jeff Katz, recently terminated from the employ of the University of California. He has been hired at Rutgers University and is doing very well, thank you.

INSIDE:

Proposal for Local Merger 2
General Meeting for Merger Discussion 3
HELP! HELP! 3
Victory for a Fighter 4
Parking Update 4
Opening the Door 5
Who Makes the Final Decision? 5
Update on Lateral Promotions at UCB 5
Moffitt and Main Emergency Procedures 5
Linking Librarians and Faculty Unions 6

SHAIN RETURNS

We're glad to see that Charlie Shain is back at work at the Environmental Design Library and looking so well and rested. Welcome back!

PROPOSAL FOR LOCAL MERGER

The following is the text of the proposal to merge AFT Locals 1474 (lecturers) and 1795 (librarians) by an interim year arrangement. Attached to this newsletter is a ballot for you to use to vote on this proposal. In addition, Phil Hoehn has written a rationale for the merger which gives some background for the proposal.

PROPOSAL:

- We propose that the two Berkeley locals form a Joint Executive Board.
- The board should consist of four voting members from AFT 1474: the President, Vice-President, Secretary and Treasurer, and four voting members from AFT 1795: the President, Vice-President, Secretary-Treasurer and one other representative.
- Other members of each local's Executive Committee, the chapter chairs for the Senate Faculty and Researchers, and the Newsletter Editor, shall all be welcome to attend, but without vote. The Joint Executive Board shall designate a Joint President, Joint Vice-President and Secretary from among those who are voting members of the Board.
- Each local will retain its own separate Constitution, status and elected officers during the interim period.
- The Joint Executive Board should meet regularly from April 15, 1990 to April 15, 1991, to conduct the business of the two locals. Its purview shall include participation or relations with other union organizations, dealings with campus labor relations and other administrators, oversight of the two treasuries and coordination of grievance handling, contract reopeners and recruitment.
- Four chapters would be formed, one for librarians, one for non-Senate faculty, one for researchers and one for Senate faculty. [The last two may be nominal]. Each chapter would have a chair. In the case of librarians and non-Senate faculty, the local President would act as chapter chair, and serve as the local contract administrator and grievance chair. Each chapter would meet as necessary to discuss topics of common concern, including grievance handling, contract administration, reopeners and recruitment.
- The Joint Executive Board will send representatives, or a single representative, to various

UFL NEWS: A Newsletter of the University Federation of Librarians, Berkeley Campus, AFT Local 1795

UFL News is produced by the Executive Committee of the University Federation of Librarians, Berkeley Campus, AFT Local 1795, a part of University Council-AFT, representing Faculty, Librarians and Academic Researchers of the University of California.

Members of the Executive Committee are:

President

Susana Hinojosa, Moffitt Library

Vice-President

Roy Ortopan, Catalog Department

Secretary-Treasurer

Phoebe Janes, Moffitt Library

Members-at-Large

Ken Logan, S/SEA Library

Bill Whitson, Moffitt Library

Lillian Castillo-Speed, Chicano Studies Library

Central Labor Council Representatives

Charles Shain, Environmental Design Library

Laurel Burley

union gatherings, including University Council-AFT.

- The Joint Executive Board will publish a joint newsletter.
- The Joint Executive Board will appoint a Constitutional Revision Committee, which will draft a new Constitution for a combined Local, by November 1, 1990.

*Dates will vary depending on vote.

GENERAL MEETING FOR MERGER DISCUSSION

There will be a meeting on June 20th at 12:00 noon in Room 322 Library to discuss the proposal for a merger of the locals. You may wait to cast your vote until the meeting. All are welcome, especially those who are interested in joining the Union. We will also have a discussion of the Librarian Review Process document written by Bill Whitson. Refreshments will be provided.

HELP! HELP!

We regularly receive notifications having to do with benefits or safety. Is anyone out there interested in analyzing them and letting us know how they might affect our Union members? Recent documents have been: "University of California Retirement Plan, Tier Two Refunds," "Employee-Paid Life Insurance Rate Adjustment," "Procedures for Inspection of University of California at Berkeley Sites by Outside Agencies," "Proposed Change in Eligibility for Employer Contribution toward University-Sponsored Annuitant Health Insurance Program...," and "University Policy on Substance Abuse in the Workplace." If you'd like to help us out or if you would like to see these documents, contact Susana Hinojosa.

VICTORY FOR A FIGHTER

We are proud of Dan Tsang, Associate Librarian from UC Irvine, (Union member) who didn't settle for less than what he deserved. Back in July of 1988 he was denied a merit increase. Tsang, an Asian-American, claimed that the denial was due to discrimination. His grievance case was seen by the UCI chancellor in April of 1989. However, Dan was evaluated again in July of 1989 and was successful in his bid for a merit increase. The other piece of good news was that his appeal to the chancellor was successful. Unfortunately, however, the campus saw fit to invalidate his second merit increase. Instead of moving him up to class IV he was told he would have to remain at class III until he was reviewed again in July of 1990. In other words, the campus was denying Tsang the remedy he had applied for when he filed his successful appeal by saying that he was going to get an increase anyway and didn't deserve two increases at

---

(clip and mail to Susana Hinojosa or bring it to the meeting on June 20 in Room 322)

☐ **I vote for the merger**

☐ **I vote against the merger**

once. Sanity prevailed when the then Executive Vice- Chancellor Chang-Lin Tien informed Tsang that he would be promoted to class IV in July 1990 and would not have to go through another review. With the help of the Union Dan courageously went through his discrimination case and then dealt with the bureaucracy that might have taken away what he had won.

PARKING UPDATE

The campus has just sent a memo (May 7th) on the proposed parking fees and new parking programs for FY 90-91. The campus proposes to introduce a Guaranteed Ride Home Program and announces the first of the satellite parking lots. This satellite parking lot will be at 8th and Harrison (next to Albany Village Family Student Housing) and will accommodate approximately 100 cars at a cost of $10.00 per month. Users of this lot will be given a free AC Transit bus pass for the 52 line which is supposed to run every 15 minutes.

Parking fees are expected to go up - for example, Central Campus fees will be $720.00 annually (up from $648) and monthly fees will be $60 (up from $54). Beth Sibley, our Parking Representative, will help us prepare a response to the above proposal. If you would like to see the entire proposal, and/or would like to comment, please contact Beth Sibley as soon as possible. We need to respond to Labor Relations by June 7th.

OPENING THE DOOR

As Gary Adest, Executive Director of the UC-AFT, pointed out in the Winter '90 issue of PERSPECTIVE, the "Open Files" lawsuit against the UC Regents may be coming to a favorable resolution with two recent developments: 1)the willingness of the University to meet with the Union in an informal discussion in the presence of Judge Low of the California Court of Appeals and; 2) the decision handed down by the Supreme Court on January 9, 1990 in favor of the Equal Opportunity Employment Commission and against the University of Pennsylvania in its attempt to keep faculty files secret in a case of suspected discrimination. The Pennsylvania case will undoubtedly put pressure on the University of California to open its files.

WHO MAKES THE FINAL DECISION?

The following letter has to do with the extent of the involvement of the University Librarian in the merit reviews of Affiliated Librarians.

DON'T FORGET TO VOTE ON THE MERGER!!

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

BERKELEY · DAVIS · IRVINE · LOS ANGELES · RIVERSIDE · SAN DIEGO · SAN FRANCISCO — SANTA BARBARA · SANTA CRUZ

CAMPUS PERSONNEL OFFICE

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720

August 2, 1989
89-206

Ms. Susana Hinojosa
United Federation of Librarians
6043 Harwood, Apt. A
Oakland, California 94618

RE: Merit and Review Procedures for Affiliated Librarians

Dear Susana:

In May you wrote to me requesting ". . . information and clarification on the merit and promotion review procedures and policies in place for Affiliated Librarians." At that time I informed you that there were no changes in those policies and procedures. You stated that you had information which would indicate otherwise. I asked that you forward the information to me. To date, I have not received that information. I can only assume, therefore, that our response was sufficient. I am closing my file on this matter.

Sincerely,

Joyce Harlan
Labor Relations

cc: Labor Relations Manager Harrington
Academic Personnel Coordinator Aasen

The UFL has received inquiries from Affiliated Librarians who wonder if the comments on their merit reviews are now coming from Joseph Rosenthal instead of from Roderic Park. It seems appropriate to bring up this issue at a time when final decisions on merit reviews and promotions are arriving. If any Affiliated Librarians have noticed a change, please contact Lily Castillo-Speed so that we can carry this inquiry further.

UPDATE ON LATERAL PROMOTIONS AT UCB

As you may remember, it was determined last year that UCB was in fact the only UC campus that made use of lateral promotions (generally these are from Associate Librarian VI to Librarian I or from Associate Librarian VII to Librarian II without a pay increase). The information was relayed to LAUC-B for possible action and discussion. Their response to us is reprinted below.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARIANS ASSOCIATION

BERKELEY · DAVIS · IRVINE · LOS ANGELES · RIVERSIDE · SAN DIEGO · SAN FRANCISCO — SANTA BARBARA · SANTA CRUZ

BERKELEY DIVISION

January 2, 1990

Susana Hinojosa, President
UFL Local 1795
Moffitt Library
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

Dear Susana:

The LAUC-B Executive Committee discussed the issue of lateral transfer at their meeting on December 20, 1989. The consensus was that this process is a benefit to librarians at UC Berkeley. Although an immediate salary increase is not involved, lateral transfer provides recognition of the individual and thus, presumably, encouragement. Also, it places the librarian in a better position for advancement--at the start of a new ladder rather being "stuck" at the end of an old one. It is an option that provides useful flexibility.

We did not feel it necessary to forward the issue for discussion to LAUC-Statewide's Committee on Professional Governance.

Sincerely,

Peter A. Evans
Chair, LAUC-B

cc: LAUC-B Ex. Comm.

The UFL Executive Committee, after some discussion, decided to forward this information to the statewide LAUC Professional Governance Committee for possible action. It is estimated that approximately 12-15 librarians at UCB have received lateral promotions within the last 5-6 years.

In addition, the LAUC Professional Governance Committee has been asked for clearer language in the provision requiring that Assistant Librarians be granted career status (and promotion) within six years or be terminated. Recently an Assistant Librarian at UCB was required to undergo his final up-or-out review within his fifth probationary year and was terminated after exactly five and one-half years of service. The administration's interpretation of this rule was that all service plus the six months notice (after career status is denied) should all be within the six years. Clearer language should prevent this type of action in the future.

MOFFITT AND MAIN EMERGENCY PROCEDURES

Last April 19 and 20 a foul odor permeated the Moffitt and Main Libraries. Since it could not have been immediately known that the odor was harmless some librarians expressed dismay that there was no word at the time on what procedures should be followed. One of two options might have been chosen by management: 1) assure everyone that everything was all right and to continue working or 2) evacuate the buildings, investigate the problem, and reopen. If you have comments or questions about emergency procedures, please contact us.

LINKING THE LIBRARIANS AND THE FACULTY UNIONS

Senate faculty, librarians, and researchers were the founding members of the Berkeley Faculty Union (Local 1474) in 1963. Fairly early on, however, divergent interests developed between librarian and Senate faculty members. While librarians are largely concerned with inadequate salaries, poor working conditions, and gaining professional status, the faculty members are, to a large extent, interested in equally-important campus political issues. In order to better pursue their own interests (and with the blessing of the Faculty Union), librarians formed a separate union local in 1967. The American Federation of Teachers (AFT) issued a charter to Local 1795 (The University Federation of Librarians) — the only one granted by a national labor organization to a group of academic librarians.

Librarians on all other UC campuses (and indeed at all other academic institutions throughout the country) remained in locals with senate faculty or other academic employees. The librarians at UCLA — a far higher number (and percentage) of whom are AFT members than at Berkeley — are members of their campus' single AFT local. They have a librarian representative on the governing board of the local, but the librarian members meet separately as a caucus, much like the Berkeley librarians local. The UCLA model appears to be working quite well. Because conditions have changed dramatically since 1967 — the union is now a bargaining agent, for one thing — the executive boards of the two Berkeley campus AFT locals have taken a fresh look at the desirability of maintaining separate organizations. They have concluded that there are a number of compelling reasons to merge the two locals. As an interim step toward eventual merger, the two local executive boards are recommending a one-year transitional, umbrella organization which would perform some of the functions of each local. Separate chapters for each of the four groups of academic employees (Senate faculty, non-Senate teachers, librarians, and researchers) would be established. These chapters would have representatives on a merged organization's executive board, and would hold their own membership meetings to discuss issues of particular concern to each group. During the interim period, members and officers of each local would have an opportunity to judge how successful a full-blown merger would be, to draft a proposed constitution for a new, merged organization, and to vote to accept or reject the merger of the two locals.

REASONS FOR MERGING:

1. *Better Utilization of Member and Officer Time.* At present a number of activities which would be done once in a unified Berkeley local are done twice — once by each local. For example, each local receives quantities of identical mail and phone solicitations from affiliated or-

ganizations, from the University, and from other groups. It requires considerable time (usually by each local's President, Secretary, and Treasurer) to receive, digest and act on this information. Often issues must be brought to and discussed by each local's executive committee.

2. *Sharing Leadership Duties*. At present, the locals have a double set of officers, e.g., two presidents, two vice presidents, etc. A portion of the work done by each of these local officers is duplicated in each local. In a single local, much of this duplication could be avoided. Since there has been a chronic undersupply of members willing to serve as officers in each local, a consolidation could alleviate this problem to a substantial degree. Decreasing the number of duplicative officers might also free up time for other tasks which are not now being done, e.g., recruiting, political action, networking with other organizations.

3. *Eliminating Duplicate Representation*. Each local must — or should — send representatives to meetings of the following organizations: the Central Labor Council of Alameda County, the San Francisco Labor Council, the University Council-AFT, and California Federation of Teachers (CFT) Area Council meetings. Other groups call meetings or hold other events at which both locals are now invited to send representatives. In many cases, a single unified local could be represented quite adequately by one representative rather than two.

4. *Enhancing our Voice*. By having a larger membership base, representatives from a merged organization would have more clout when representing the interests of Berkeley campus academic employees. This would occur at meetings with campus labor relations, as well as in those of affiliated labor organizations. For example, during the past year in those instances when Local 1474 did not have a representative at a UC-AFT meeting, Berkeley has been limited to the one vote of the Local 1795 representative, rather than to the five votes to which it would be entitled as a merged organization.

5. *Reducing Duplicate Communications*. Each local must communicate with its union and unit members, and on occasion each prepares leaflets and newsletters which communicate identical information. Writing, layout and reproduction of these publications is time consuming, and a certain amount of the present practice involves needless duplication of effort. Since the members and employees represented by each local are widely dispersed throughout the campus, a joint distribution network would be much more efficient. For example, a single distribution in Wurster Hall could easily deliver material into the mailboxes of all academic employees in the three or four departments and the two libraries within the building, rather than continuing two separate distributions.

6. *Saving Money*. Avoiding duplicate work above would not only save officer and member time, but would also save money. Phone, postage, and travel costs could be reduced, perhaps significantly, if unnecessary duplicate work and representation were eliminated. Economies of scale could be realized in the production of combined newsletters and leaflets since per-unit reproduction costs typically decrease as the number of copies goes up. The Librarians local (and the unit it represents) is too small to use low-cost bulk mailing; this distribution method would be practical for the larger mailings which a single, unified local could put out.

7. *Improving Services*. A single, large local could improve services to members by combining resources. Money and time saved by eliminating unnecessary duplicated efforts could be channeled into more productive uses. For example, joint

grievance training sessions and periodic meetings of grievance chairs could share information about potential grievances or grievances in progress. Joint workshops, program meetings, and social events would be easier to arrange with a single local. Activities in which each local is now only marginally involved, e.g., political action, could be increased with participation from a larger membership pool or from the time freed from the elimination of duplicative work.

8. *Cutting the Expenses of Affiliated Organizations*. Each of the organizations with which we are affiliated (the central labor councils, the California Labor Federation, the CFT, the AFT, and the University Council-AFT) now keeps separate financial and other information for the two locals. They also mail separate sets of material to each local. Obviously, it would be more efficient and less costly for them to deal with a single Berkeley local. Of most direct concern to us is the University Council- AFT. Not only must it do double bookkeeping for our two locals, but it pays the University an extra $120 per year for payroll deduction charges for the second Berkeley local. The time and money each of these organizations could save by eliminating one Berkeley local could be put to better use and would ultimately benefit our members. It is not, therefore surprising that a unified Berkeley local is strongly favored by the University Council-AFT, the CFT, and the AFT.

9. *Eliminating Confusion about Berkeley's Anomalous Local*. In conversations with librarians on other campuses and with persons delving into union organization at the University, it is necessary to explain why Berkeley has a separate librarian local. Since a good reason is not easily put forward or grasped by the listener, a good deal of time is wasted on a relatively trivial matter. Even CFT and AFT officers and staff continue to operate under the mistaken impression that Local 1795 represents all librarians Systemwide; no amount of explanation has been able to shake this belief.

UFL NEWS: a newsletter of the University Federation of Librarians, AFT Local 1795

TO: